



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/687,213

10/15/2003

Lance A. Tatman

10030378-1

7146

7590 03/27/2008
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Department, DL 429
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

EXAMINER

HARPER, KEVIN C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2616

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/27/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/687,213</p>	<p>Applicant(s) TATMAN ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner Kevin C. Harper</p>	<p>Art Unit 2616</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 4, 5 and 8-18.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Kevin C. Harper/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2616
March 23, 2008

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicants argued that Goringe teaches away from flooding the network. However, the determination of obviousness is based on combining prior art elements that achieve predictable results. Because Goringe discloses the prior art of the art as providing flooding within a network, one skilled in the art would recognize sending messages to all routers (para. 7, lines 7-8) would have the predictable result of providing an autonomous topology determination (para. 5) and providing a detailed map of the network (para. 6, lines 1-9) at the expense of excess data in the network (para. 7, lines 8-11).

Applicant's argued that Goringe does not teach a probe connected to a router in each area to receive data from the router in each area. However, the border routers belong to more than one area and receive data from each router in respective area that it belongs (para 23, lines 20-26). Further, routers that are not area border routers have information from each router its area (para. 23, lines 26-30).

Applicant argued that Goringe does not disclose a probe having adjacency to a router in each area. However, the probe of Goringe communicates with at least one border area routers that is located within more than one area (para. 23, lines 20-26). Greenberg discloses that probes are located adjacent to routers (fig. 1). Therefore, the combination provides a teaching and motivation to locate the probes adjacent to the border area router in order to communicate with the router. Furthermore, the combination of Goringe in view of Greenberg also meets the claimed invention by the disclosure in Greenberg for having a centralized probe (fig. 1, LSAG; para. 15, lines 1-7).

Applicant argued that Goringe does not provide for sub-interfaces. However, Goringe provides interfaces with separate IP addresses that belong to different regions (fig. 1, item 104c; note: this router has links to routers in different regions that correspond to different IP addresses - figs. 4 and 8). The present invention notes that a sub-interface is based on connectivity to different regions (specification, page 8, lines 11-17) as similarly described in Goringe. Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide sub-interfaces to various regions in order to intercommunicate with these regions (using IP addressing as is known in the art) (Goringe, figs. 4 and 8; para. 29, lines 1-3; para. 25, lines 6-13).